

Who Is like David? Was David like David? Good Kings in the Book of Kings

ALISON L. JOSEPH

Villanova University

Villanova, PA 19085

Abstract: Of the more than forty monarchs who rule the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, only three are said to be like David, the paradigm of the good king. What qualifies one to be “like David”? Would David, as portrayed in Samuel, stack up to these criteria? This article is a study of the accolades given to only a handful of the kings—those who do what is pleasing to Yhwh, whose hearts are with Yhwh, the very few who are like David. The regnal formula evaluations, a product of Deuteronomistic composition, are sparing with compliments. By tracking the various elements of the positive judgments, we can derive criteria for what qualifies a king to be so described. In doing this, it is possible to see that the description of the acts of David in Samuel is not similar to the David of Kings constructed as the standard for kings’ evaluations. The “David” of Kings is a royal prototype reflecting Deuteronomistic interests and is a literary tool used to measure the other kings. Through this study, we can see the work of the Deuteronomist and the relationship between the Deuteronomistic composition in Kings and that in Samuel.

Key Words: David • Book of Kings • Deuteronomistic History

IN THE BOOK OF KINGS, the Deuteronomist uses a royal prototype to evaluate each king in the history of the monarchy. The bad kings, those who do what is “evil in the eyes of Yhwh,” are compared to Jeroboam and Ahab, and often to each king’s father if his father acted similarly. The good kings, those who do what is “right in the eyes of Yhwh,” are compared to their own fathers, if they were also good. Only

An earlier version of this article was delivered in the Deuteronomistic History Section at the Society of Biblical Literature annual meeting in San Francisco, California, November 21, 2011.

three kings, Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah, are compared to David, who is set up as the prototype of the good king. This raises the question, What does it mean to be like David? Is there some set of criteria that can be derived from the narrative of Kings that would qualify a certain king to be like or unlike David? Furthermore, would David, as represented in Samuel, be “like David” as constructed in Kings, or is David, as the standard for good kings, exclusively a Deuteronomistic construct and typological tool?

In this article, I will explore the range of the Davidic prototype and what it means to “be like David.” Through the analysis of the individual regnal formulae of the good kings, it is possible to answer some of these questions. Once the model has been established, it can be used to reflect back on the character of David, exploring whether David is actually like his literary alter ego. Establishing the range of this prototype and its antithesis gives us a deeper look at the Deuteronomist’s historiographical poetics and the literary methods used in constructing the portrait of his kings.¹

This analysis will contribute to several scholarly conversations. It points to the heart of the debate about the relationship between Kings and the rest of the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), considering the role of the author/redactor in Kings and the DtrH as well as determining the strata of composition and redaction. The centrality of Josiah in the use of the Davidic prototype points to a Josianic history, combatting arguments by Iain Provan, W. Boyd Barrick, Lauren A. S. Monroe, Benjamin D. Thomas, and others for a Hezekian history.² It also supports Frank Moore Cross’s “block” model, demonstrating an intentional literary technique used in 1 Kings 1–2 Kings 23, in the accounts of the reigns of the Dtr’s important kings.³ Furthermore, this is contrary to the strata model of composition espoused by Rudolf Smend, Walter Dietrich, Timo Veijola, and others,⁴

¹ Ehud Ben Zvi describes a literary technique in which Josiah and Manasseh are set up as a thesis/antithesis, illustrating a “paradigmatic opposition between Manasseh and Josiah” (“The Account of the Reign of Manasseh in II Reg 21:1-18 and the Redactional History of the Book of Kings,” *ZAW* 103 [1991] 355-74, here 360).

² Iain W. Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings: A Contribution to the Debate about the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (BZAW 172; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1988); W. Boyd Barrick, *The King and the Cemeteries: Toward a New Understanding of Josiah’s Reform* (VTSup 88; Leiden: Brill, 2002); Lauren A. S. Monroe, *Josiah’s Reform and the Dynamics of Defilement: Israelite Rites of Violence and the Making of a Biblical Text* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011); Benjamin D. Thomas, *Hezekiah and the Compositional History of the Book of Kings* (FAT 2/63; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

³ For the designation Dtr, see n. 9 below.

⁴ Rudolf Smend, “Das Gesetz und die Völker: Ein Beitrag zur deuteronomistischen Redaktionsgeschichte,” in *Probleme biblischer Theologie: Gerhard von Rad zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Hans Walter Wolff; Munich: Kaiser, 1971) 494-509; Walter Dietrich, *Prophezie und Geschichte: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk* (FRLANT 108; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972); Timo Veijola, *Die ewige Dynastie: David und die*

demonstrating the employment of an intentional literary technique that spans almost the entirety of the first edition of the history, rather than being limited to individual strata. The prototype strategy establishes linguistic criteria for identifying a distinct redactional layer, directing the reader to view the historian's literary use of the narratives of the individual kings to promote his theological program. Focus on the Davidic prototype highlights the literary value of the Dtr's composition and redaction. This contributes to the conversation considering the continued interpretative yield of redaction criticism, as in the recent volume of collected essays *Soundings in Kings* (2010).⁵ In his concluding remarks to this volume, Mark Leuchter presents a challenge to move beyond the "redaction-critical method that has dominated the study of Kings for the last sixty years" and to read Kings with a "more nuanced approach."⁶ He contends that one should no longer view Kings as a source of history but should acknowledge that "authorial intent plays too often and too dramatically with the traditions and details inherited by the writers/redactors of the work for us to obtain a clear understanding of Israel's actual history when relying on Kings as a source of information."⁷ The consideration of the royal prototype offers a view into the author's intentional method.

The use of a royal prototype strategy is a key element of the Dtr's historiographical process.⁸ It is one of the major organizing structures employed throughout Kings. The Dtr concentrates on the royal portrait as a literary vehicle to convey his theological program. It is a way in which he can categorize the kings into two groups: those who do what is right and those who do what is evil in the eyes of Yhwh. Among those kings, the Dtr highlights a few specific rulers to make clear what behavior is to be tolerated and praised in his kings.⁹ The prototype of the king

Entstehung seiner Dynastie nach der deuteronomistischen Darstellung (Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 193; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1975); Albert de Pury and Thomas Römer, "Deuteronomistic Historiography (DH): History of Research and Debated Issues," in *Israel Constructs Its History: Deuteronomistic Historiography in Recent Research* (JSOTSup 306; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 68-70; Walter Dietrich, "Martin Noth and the Future of the Deuteronomistic History," in *The History of Israel's Traditions: The Heritage of Martin Noth* (ed. Steven L. McKenzie and M. Patrick Graham; JSOTSup 182; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994) 156.

⁵ Mark Leuchter and Klaus-Peter Adam, eds., *Soundings in Kings: Perspectives and Methods in Contemporary Scholarship* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2010).

⁶ Mark Leuchter, "Closing Remarks," in *Soundings in Kings* (ed. Leuchter and Adam) 143-46, here 144.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 143.

⁸ See my forthcoming book on the historiographical poetics of the Dtr, *Portrait of the Kings: The Davidic Prototype in Deuteronomistic Poetics* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015).

⁹ Throughout this article, the designation Dtr (unless otherwise stated) will refer to the preexilic, Josianic Deuteronomist, similar to the author/editor described by Frank Moore Cross in "The Themes of the Book of Kings and the Structure of the Deuteronomistic History," in *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1973) 274-89. While the debate of the merits and disadvantages of this and other

is steeped in Deuteronomistic language and concerns. Instead of being portrayed as a "real" person, each king is evaluated through the lens of the prototype to assess his fidelity to the covenant and his love of Yhwh.

In Kings, the Dtr uses a Davidic prototype (positively and negatively) to construct the portrait of his kings.¹⁰ This prototype is based on a literary picture of David in which David is the exemplum of covenant fidelity. He is the model of the Deuteronomistically adherent king, the one whom all subsequent kings are required to emulate. The Dtr uses David as the royal comparative to construct the portrait of both good and bad kings. The good kings are those who are like David, while the bad kings are those who are not.

This portrait of David is very different from that found in Samuel. Early on, Gerhard von Rad, followed by Richard Nelson, observed that the David of Samuel is free of Deuteronomistic additions.¹¹ In contrast, in Kings, David is used "as the prototype of a king who was well-pleasing to Jahweh."¹² In this way, according to von Rad, David "is the king after the heart of the Deuteronomist. He is the prototype of the perfectly obedient anointed, and therefore the model for all succeeding kings in Jerusalem."¹³

While my argument for the use of a prototype strategy builds on this idea, it takes into account further literary considerations. Cognitive linguistics can help us consider what a literary prototype is and how it functions in our historical narratives. Linguist George Lakoff defines prototypes as "cognitive reference points of various sorts [that] form the basis for inferences."¹⁴ These inferences are part of the conceptual structure, in which prototypes have a "special cognitive status" of being a "best example."¹⁵ In Kings, prototypes of individual kings (David as the model for the good king and an anti-David for the bad king) are laid out, allowing the reader to consider each king and his individual acts on micro and macro levels: what did this king do and how do his character and reign fit into the larger history of Israel and Judah and reflect the way Yhwh works in history? Furthermore, the

redactional theories is beyond the scope of this article, recognition of the use of the prototype strategy can be used as another criterion to designate the work of the preexilic and exilic Deuteronomists.

¹⁰ A modified version of the prototype strategy is used in the construction of the character of Joshua, in which Joshua is portrayed as the model for Josiah. For more, see Richard D. Nelson, "Josiah in the Book of Joshua," *JBL* 100 (1981) 531-40.

¹¹ Gerhard von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FRLANT 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1947); Richard D. Nelson, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 18; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

¹² Gerhard von Rad, "The Deuteronomistic Theology of History in the Books of Kings," in *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. David Stalker; SBT 9; London: SCM, 1953) 86.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹⁴ George Lakoff, *Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things: What Categories Reveal about the Mind* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) 45.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 41.

use of a prototype allows the reader to infer information about each king without the narrator supplying it because he is cast in a certain mold that the audience already recognizes.¹⁶

I. Establishing the Prototype through the Regnal Formula

The regnal formula has long been seen by scholars as an unequivocal site of Deuteronomistic evaluation.¹⁷ At the start of the account of each king, the Dtr includes a formulaic introduction that gives details about the king's background and reign as well as an evaluation measuring the king by Deuteronomistic standards. The regnal formula is a narrative tool used by the Dtr to synchronize the narratives about the kings of Israel and Judah, to make the chronology of events and reigns clear, to create segues and uniformity in the presentation of the information about each king, and, most important, to put into application the major concepts of Deuteronomistic theology through the judgment formulae. The Dtr uses these formulae to interpret the narratives, employing them to frame and mold the story of each king. Further, according to Reinhard G. Kratz, the regnal evaluations "add concrete cultic measures: depending on the king's piety [and] the introduction or the abolition of high places, altars," and other foreign practices, making clear that "alongside the ideal of unity of the kingdom and the cult there is the ideal of purity of the cult."¹⁸ In this way, the formulae are intrinsically linked to the process of historiography. They are also the place where the application of the Davidic prototype begins. Though scholarship on these formulae has largely been focused on synchronizing chronology between the two kingdoms and as signs of different levels of redaction, the accession formulae deserve inquiry on their own merit, in addition to the teasing out of redactional layers.¹⁹

¹⁶ This is the nature of the use of typology in general and how convention helps us read by creating systems of recognizable patterns. For more, see Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic, 1981) 47-62; idem, "How Convention Helps Us Read: The Case of the Bible's Annunciation Type-Scene," *Prooftexts* 3 (1983) 115-30; idem, "Imagining History in the Bible," in *History and—: Histories within the Human Sciences* (ed. Ralph Cohen and Michael S. Roth; Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1995) 53-72.

¹⁷ Steven L. McKenzie, *The Trouble with Kings: The Composition of the Book of Kings in the Deuteronomistic History* (VTSup 42; Leiden/New York: Brill, 1991) 117.

¹⁸ Reinhard G. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (trans. John Bowden; London/New York: T&T Clark, 2005) 162.

¹⁹ For recent work on the regnal formulae, see Richard D. Nelson, "The Regnal Formulae in Kings," in idem, *Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History*, 29-42. Baruch Halpern and David S. Vanderhooft, "The Editions of Kings in the 7th-6th Centuries BCE," *HUCA* 62 (1991) 179-244; Iain W. Provan, "The Judgment Formulae of the Books of Kings," in idem, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 33-55; Antony F. Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings: A Late Ninth-Century Document (1 Samuel 1-2 Kings 10)* (CBQMS 17; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association

Redactional conversations attempt to divide the individual formulae into patterns. Helga Weippert contends that there are as many as six different formula patterns, reflecting three levels of redaction (and a northern and southern version at each level). Recently, many scholars (including Barrick, Enzo Cortese, Provan, and Antony F. Campbell) have argued with and against Weippert. While the patterns that she isolates are important to recognize, for my purpose in understanding what makes a good king and what makes one like David, the distinctions are not necessary. In this discussion, I will consider the regnal formulae of eight kings as part of the same pattern, a product of the Josianic redactor. These kings are the following: Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, Hezekiah, and Josiah. All of these kings are said to do *הישר בעיני יהוה*, "What is right in the eyes of Yhwh."²⁰ Though some scholars exclude a few of the kings I have mentioned from this pattern, even if the kings were the product of subsequent redactors, it does not affect the case for trying to understand what the Josianic author/redactor constructed in the figure of David.²¹ These scholars also isolate a second pattern, a subset of those who do what is right with those kings also compared with David (Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah). Despite these arguments, I will include the two patterns together on the grounds that either the Josianic redactor is responsible for both patterns or he inherited the earlier "like David" tradition and then exploited

of America, 1986); Erik Eynikel, *The Reform of King Josiah and the Composition of the Deuteronomistic History* (OTS 33; Leiden: Brill, 1995); Helga Weippert, "Die deuteronomistischen Beurteilungen der Könige von Israel und Juda und das Problem der Redaktion der Königsbücher," *Bib* 53 (1972) 301-39; W. Boyd Barrick, "On the Removal of the High-Places in 1-2 Kings," *Bib* 55 (1974) 257-59; Klaus-Peter Adam, "Warfare and Treaty Formulas in the Background of Kings," in *Soundings in Kings* (ed. Leuchter and Adam), 35-68; Thomas, *Hezekiah and the Compositional History*, 62-177.

²⁰ There is disagreement on the provenance of various redactors, but there is some consensus among scholars that most of the kings' formulae that I am concerned with here are identified as deriving from the same hand and as part of the same pattern (Weippert's RIS1; Campbell's B pattern; Provan's Hezekian Redaction). Weippert includes Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Amaziah, Azariah, Jotham, and Josiah in her RIS1 pattern (first redaction, southern kings, 1 for *הישר*; the negative assessments are 2). She identifies Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah as part of RIIS (second southern redaction) ("Beurteilungen der Könige," 308, 325, 335). Barrick wants to extend Weippert's designation of RI (Jehoshaphat to Ahaz) to include Asa and Hezekiah ("On the Removal of the High-Places," 258). Provan argues for their inclusion as well, asserting that it is impossible to attribute the David and *bāmôt* elements of the formulae to different authors (*Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 53). Provan and Campbell both exclude Josiah's formula from this pattern: Campbell because he sees Hezekiah as the last of his pre-Dtr "B" pattern, and Provan because he identifies a Hezekian provenance for the primary preexilic DtrH. See also Enzo Cortese, "Theories concerning Dtr: A Possible Rapprochement," in *Pentateuchal and Deuteronomistic Studies: Papers Read at the XIIIth IOSOT Congress, Leuven 1989* (ed. C. Brekelmans and J. Lust; BETL 94; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990) 179-90.

²¹ Halpern and Vanderhooft argue that the variations in the regnal evaluations are not reliable proof for the distinguishing of editions ("Editions of Kings," 179-244).

it in his composition. Yet, though the regnal formulae simultaneously display diversity and unity, they seem to be constructed on the same model and from the same hand. In the evaluations of the “good” kings, there are three elements included in the designation of “good.” These are the assertion that the king does *הישר בעיני יהוה*, a paternal comparison (to David the ancestral father or to the literal father), and whether the king’s *לֵבב* (“heart”) is with Yhwh.²² By tracking these designations, I attempt to discover what it means to be a “good” king, even the best of kings, and whether David in Samuel can measure up to these standards.

A. “*What Is Right in the Eyes of Yhwh*” (*הישר בעיני יהוה*)

Of the more than forty monarchs who reign over Israel and Judah only eight are reported to have done what is right in Yhwh’s eyes, *הישר בעיני יהוה*.²³ All of these are kings of Judah. The command to do what is right in the eyes of Yhwh is a Deuteronomistic injunction, intrinsically linked to observing the commandments. This phrase is first used in Deut 6:18, where the connection to the Deuteronomistic covenant is made clear and defines how one does what is right: *שמור תשמרון את מצות יהוה אלהיכם ועדתיו וחקייו אשר צוך ועשית הישר והטוב בעיני יהוה*, “Surely you shall keep the commandments of Yhwh your God, his testimonies and his statutes which he commanded you. And you shall do what is right and good in the eyes of Yhwh” (vv. 17-18; cf. Deut 13:19). The kings who do what is right in Yhwh’s eyes are those who keep the commandments and are faithful to Deuteronomistic theology and covenant. Throughout the DtrH, obedience to these commandments and statutes is repeated.

B. “*Like David His Father*” (*כדוד אביו*)

The designation of doing what is right is connected with being like David only four times in the evaluations of the good kings (Asa, Amaziah, Hezekiah, and Josiah), yet one of these connections is negative.²⁴ (Amaziah is explicitly not like David but like his father, Joash [2 Kgs 14:3].²⁵) Due to the infrequency of the

²² It is interesting to note that those scholars who deal with parsing the various patterns of the regnal formulae do not identify *לֵבב* as a constituent element. Instead they focus on the judgment, the comparison, and the *במית* theme. This may reflect scholarship that does not recognize the majority of these accession formulae as Deuteronomistic and *לֵבב* as an unequivocally Deuteronomistic concept (Campbell, *Of Prophets and Kings*, 144-51; Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 33-55; Weippert, “Beurteilungen der Könige,” 301-39). Only von Rad seems to acknowledge the use of *לֵבב* in constructing the prototype (von Rad, “Deuteronomistic Theology,” 87-88).

²³ Asa (1 Kgs 15:11), Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:43), Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:3), Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:3), Azariah (2 Kgs 15:3), Jotham (2 Kgs 15:34), Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3), Josiah (2 Kgs 22:2).

²⁴ Twice a bad king is said to be not like David (Abijam [1 Kgs 15:3] and Ahaz [2 Kgs 16:2]). For this reason, Weippert includes them in her RI (“Beurteilungen der Könige,” 335).

²⁵ Many scholars see this negative comparison to David as a secondary addition (Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 93).

connection to David, it is difficult to understand what is deemed right or not right in Yhwh's eyes and what it means to be like or unlike David. If we take the formulaic assessments and the collection of information about the acts of each king in the subsequent narrative and use his deeds as evidence for designation, the evidence is contradictory. Moreover, though one may wonder why a comparison made so infrequently should be considered of utmost importance, the instructions given to Solomon as he becomes king make clear that being like David is essential for the proper behavior of kings.

It has long been argued that Josiah is the hero of the DtrH, and many also include Hezekiah as well. Both Hezekiah and Josiah executed major religious reforms, carrying out the religious ideals of Deuteronomistic theology. Hezekiah tore down the high places, removing an asherah and *maṣṣēbôt* ("standing stone"), and took down the bronze serpent, Nehustan, that Moses had erected, because people were worshiping it. Josiah, upon finding a law scroll in the temple, reaffirmed the covenant, purged Israel and Judah of idolatrous practices—tearing down cult sites, removing objects from the temple, deposing idolatrous priests—and celebrated the Passover. The praise for these kings is unparalleled. They are both set up as incomparable kings.²⁶ We are told about both Hezekiah and Josiah that there was never before or since someone like him. Hezekiah is not merely like David (as reported in the Asa account), but he does "all that David his father did," כל אשר עשה דוד אביו (2 Kgs 18:3). Even more impressive is Josiah's emulation of David: וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאלו, "And he walked in all the ways of David his father and did not stray to the right or left" (2 Kgs 22:2).²⁷ This collocation is in contrast to the bad kings of Israel who walk in the way of Jeroboam (וילך בדרך ירבעם).

It is not surprising that Hezekiah and Josiah are both compared to David, but the designation of King Asa is less expected. The account begins, "[King Asa] did what was right in the eyes of Yhwh, like his father David" (1 Kgs 15:11). He expelled the *qēdēšīm* ("cult prostitutes") and removed the idols his ancestors had made; he deposed his mother, Maacah, as queen mother because she had made an asherah. He brought votive gifts to the temple but later took gold and silver from the temple to make a treaty (rather like a bribe) with Ben-Hadad against Baasha of Israel. Even though Asa did many things directed toward cultic reform, he did not remove the high places. Mordechai Cogan describes these inconsistent actions as "deviations from cultic rigorism."²⁸ The quality of "rightness" of Asa's deeds is mixed: he got rid of idolatrous practices but did not remove the high places; he

²⁶ Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:5-6), Josiah (2 Kgs 23:25)

²⁷ The comment about Josiah is made in the concluding formula of his reign, while the others are in the accession formula. This may be significant for the chronology of the composition and the construction of this contention.

²⁸ Mordechai Cogan, *1 Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 10; New York: Doubleday, 2001) 398 n. 14.

brought offerings to the temple but also took from it to promote his foreign policy. Though it is not explicitly stated, Asa's taking objects from the temple likely would have been viewed negatively by the Dtr.²⁹ Deuteronomistic notice of construction in the temple adds to the positive assessment in the routine formula, but taking the treasure to enlist foreigners against the northern kingdom is not positive.³⁰ Regardless of the mixed deeds, Asa's acts earn him triple praise: he does what is right; he is like David; and his heart was completely with Yhwh (לִבּוֹ הָיָה שָׁלֵם עִם יְהוָה) (1 Kgs 15:14) all his days. Given the emphasis on the Deuteronomistic purge of all "foreign" elements from the cult of Yhwh, even if they had been traditional features of Israelite worship in the past, the inclusion of Asa, who does not remove the high places, is baffling. Steven L. McKenzie states that "Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah are the only kings favorably compared to David because they are the only reforming kings."³¹ Yet Asa's reform is incomplete, and Jehoshaphat seems to be a reformer as well.

The addition of Asa to Hezekiah and Josiah is unclear, and the designation is even more confusing when compared to the evaluation and deeds of Asa's son, Jehoshaphat, who is portrayed very similarly. It is even possible to view his actions as more praiseworthy than Asa's, yet he does not receive the same acclaim. Jehoshaphat "walked in all the ways of his father Asa; he did not stray from them, doing what was right in the eyes of Yhwh" (1 Kgs 22:43). Like Asa, he did not remove the high places, but he made peace with Israel (v. 44) rather than taking from the temple to secure allies against Israel (it is unclear whether peace or war with Israel is judged positively or negatively by the Dtr, but likely the Dtr did not approve of taking gold and silver from the temple).³² Jehoshaphat removed the remnant of the *qēdēšim* who were left from the days of Asa (v. 46). This statement belies the fact that the act for which Asa receives the highest praise was incomplete, and Jehoshaphat has to rectify the situation.³³ Provan suggests a reason for Asa's acclaim: "[W]hile it is true that only Asa, Hezekiah and Josiah are compared

²⁹ Ibid., 402.

³⁰ Mordechai Cogan and Hayim Tadmor, *II Kings: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 11; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1988) 141. Also, in his discussion of the regnal formulae, Adam highlights three criteria for positive judgment: (1) above average term of office, (2) military success, and (3) religious impact ("Warfare and Treaty Formulas," 39). These are descriptive qualifications derived from weighing the details given about each of the positively regarded kings. The second element, military success, is based on the example of Asa in 1 Kgs 15:17-23 but is not precedent setting. According to Adam, this is the only example of military success except for Ahaz, who has some measure of military success and has a partly positive judgment (p. 39). In addition, there is no evaluation in the text of the military success against Israel, so it is not known whether the author regarded it positively.

³¹ McKenzie, *Trouble with Kings*, 119.

³² Cogan, *I Kings*, 402; contra Adam, "Warfare and Treaty Formulas," 35-68.

³³ This act is seemingly incomplete, as Josiah also removes the houses of the *qēdēšim* (2 Kgs 23:7). Their existence perhaps is a persistent trope.

positively to David, it is equally true that only these three kings attempted reformation.³⁴ Does this mean that Jehoshaphat's purge of the *qēdēšîm* is not a reform?

For these deeds, Jehoshaphat receives only one element of praise, that he did right in Yhwh's eyes. Instead of being compared to David, the ancestral father, Jehoshaphat is compared to his actual father, Asa, and nothing is said about his heart. One difference is that Jehoshaphat's act of removing the *qēdēšîm* is included only in the closing formula rather than in the introductory formula, as in Asa's case. But the reforms of Josiah are also not included in the introductory formula. After Josiah's introduction, the narrative continues with the finding of the scroll in the temple. Thus, this difference may be inconsequential in determining why Asa is so praised.

Perhaps the account of Jehoshaphat is not the best test case because his evaluation is constructed differently from those of the other seven kings who do what is right. Except for Jehoshaphat, the evaluation begins with יהוה בעיני יהוה. In all but one case (Jehoash³⁵), the verse then continues with a comparison: Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah to David; and Amaziah (additionally, not like David), Azariah, and Jotham, to their fathers. In the case of Jehoshaphat the judgment begins with the comparison and is followed by the יהוה בעיני יהוה phrase. In the chart below the anomaly of the construction of Jehoshaphat's evaluation is quite clear.

	Like David/father	PN did what was right in Yhwh's eyes
Asa (1 Kgs 15:11)	כדוד אביו	ויעש אסא הישר בעיני יהוה
Hezekiah (2 Kgs 18:3)	ככל אשר עשה דוד אביו	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Josiah (2 Kgs 22:2)	וילך בכל דרך דוד אביו ולא סר ימין ושמאל	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:43)	לא סר ממנו לעשות הישר בעיני יהוה	וילך בכל דרך אסא אביו
Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:3)	רק לא כדוד אביו ככל אשר עשה יואש אביו עשה	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Azariah (2 Kgs 15:3)	ככל אשר עשה אמציהו אביו	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Jotham (2 Kgs 15:34)	ככל אשר עשה עזיהו אביו עשה	ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה
Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:3)	אשר הורהו יהוידע הכהן	ויעש יהואש הישר בעיני יהוה כל ימיו

³⁴ Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 40.

³⁵ Jehoash does not follow in the footsteps of his father, Ahaziah, the son of Athaliah, the daughter of Omri, who walked in the ways of the house of Ahab (2 Kgs 8:27). Instead, after being hidden away from his grandmother Athaliah by the priest Jehoiada, Jehoash follows the teaching of Jehoiada (2 Kgs 12:3).

The comparison of this father and son (Asa and Jehoshaphat), two of the few “good” kings, does not fully illustrate the defining criteria for praise. They both fail to carry out one of the key elements of Deuteronomistic theology: removing the high places. Yet Asa receives triple praise like Josiah and Hezekiah, who enact more thorough reforms, but Jehoshaphat does not. This situation is further confounded by considering the assessment of Amaziah. Amaziah did what was right in Yhwh’s eyes but “not like his ancestor David” (explicitly not like David, as opposed to Jehoshaphat, for whom all reference to David is omitted). Amaziah does all that his father, Joash, does (2 Kgs 14:3); Jehoash (Joash) is also said to do what was right in Yhwh’s eyes but does not remove the high places (2 Kgs 12:3, to be discussed below). Amaziah’s political acts include killing the servants who murdered his father, but not killing their children. The Dtr seems to approve of this action, giving it divine sanction and connecting it to a prescription in the law of Moses (2 Kgs 14:6). Amaziah also instigates a battle, in which he is defeated, with King Jehoash of Israel. He seems no worse than the other good kings. One difference in the indictment against Amaziah for not removing the high places, as compared to Asa, is that the narrator adds that the people continue to sacrifice at the high places—yet this is also true for Jehoshaphat, Jehoash, Azariah, and Jotham, who are all said to do what is right like their fathers. All references, positive or negative, to David are omitted in the judgment of these three kings.

	Continued to worship at <i>bāmôt</i>	Did not remove <i>bāmôt</i>
Asa (1 Kgs 15:14)	רק לבב אסא היה שלם עם יהוה כל ימיו	והבמות לא סרו
Jehoshaphat (1 Kgs 22:44)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	אך הבמות לא סרו
Jehoash (2 Kgs 12:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Amaziah (2 Kgs 14:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Azariah (2 Kgs 15:4)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו
Jotham (2 Kgs 15:35)	עוד העם מזבחים ומקטרים בבמות	רק הבמות לא סרו

Given the overwhelming praise of Josiah and Hezekiah, it seems that the designation of Asa as like David is anomalous.³⁶ If one separates Hezekiah and Josiah from the other good kings, the main differences in Asa’s religious behavior,

³⁶ The rabbis also are tight-lipped in their explanations of what it means to be like David. There are almost no comments on the three “like David” comparisons. Only in regard to the censure of Solomon in 1 Kgs 11:4 does fourteenth-century commentator Abrabanel expound on how Solomon’s heart was not like his father David’s, explaining that David would never have allowed idol worship under his roof, unlike Solomon, who permits and encourages his wives’ foreign cults. But the rabbis are emphatic in countering that Solomon himself did not sin. Further, the nineteenth-century Malbim of Ukraine explains how Amaziah did what was right but was not like David, explaining the lack of a full heart in Chronicles to mean that he served Yhwh out of habit rather than love, as David had done.

which according to the Dtr is usually what warrants evaluative judgment, is that there is no explicit report of the people continuing to sacrifice at the high places.³⁷ Since Asa does not remove the high places, the verse continues with a restrictive clause: והבמות לא סרו רק לבב אסא היה שלם עם יהוה כל ימיו, "But the high places he did not remove, yet the heart of Asa was fully with Yhwh all his days" (1 Kgs 15:14). The verse begins with a disjunctive fronting of the object, emphasizing the high places themselves, as well as grammatically separating it from the preceding verses of Asa's praiseworthy behavior and of the things that he did indeed remove (סור/): the idols (v. 12) and Maacah (v. 13). The second clause begins with רק, which introduces a restrictive clause, limiting the thrust of the first clause and allowing the second clause to take on more significance and meaning, creating a contrast with the first phrase.³⁸ Even though he did not remove the high places, Asa's heart was fully with Yhwh. This is a grammatical difference from the other reports of the nonremoval of high places. Instead of the disjunctive fronting of the object, those clauses begin with the restrictive particle רק. It is unclear whether this is significant in measuring the "rightness" of acts or whether the author just wanted to vary his construction, not beginning both clauses in 1 Kgs 15:11 with רק.³⁹

The particle רק, or in one instance אך (also a restrictive particle), is used to qualify some element of the regnal judgment. In the case of Asa, it is to restrict the degradation of his praiseworthiness and cultic commitments. Although he did not remove the high places, his heart is fully with Yhwh (1 Kgs 15:14). This same particle, רק, is used to introduce a restrictive clause in the evaluation formula of Amaziah, ויעש הישר בעיני יהוה רק לא כדוד אביו, "He did what was right in Yhwh's eyes, yet he was not like David his father" (2 Kgs 14:3). Furthermore, the rightness

³⁷ Weippert argues that the differences are the result of two different layers of redaction. Her RI does not directly blame the individual kings, but rather the people, for their sins. This is true for the southern and northern reports of this redactor. For the northern kings who did not turn away from Jeroboam's sin, the blame is on Jeroboam, not the individual king. In this way, Weippert designates the Asa report as a product of her second redactor, RII. She also includes 2 Kings 18–23 (the reports of the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah) as originating from the same hand, while the other formulae derive from her RI (Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 35–38). Though her redactional schema is not well supported, her divisions deal with contradictory elements in the pattern that are similar to those in my argument: why Asa is singled out as like David and the difference in the culpability of Asa in not removing the high places.

³⁸ GKC §153.

³⁹ Barrick argues that the differences in the words preceding the high places—ו (1 Kgs 15:14), אך (2 Kgs 22:44), and רק (2 Kgs 12:4; 14:4; 15:4, 35)—demonstrate a conscious attempt by the redactor to show a worsening situation. For this reason, he contends that Asa should be included with the work of RI ("On the Removal of the High-Places," 258). Though this may reflect a decline in the behavior of the kings, the grammar does not support this. אך and רק, as restrictive particles, seem to have the same semantic range and restrictive force (Bruce K. Waltke and M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax* [Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990] 39.3.5).

of the other five good kings is restricted by אך or רק (in the case of Jehoshaphat), that they did not remove the high places.

It seems that to be like David means to enact some kind of cultic reform, which Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah all do. Jehoshaphat enacts reforms but is not said to be like David. Furthermore, it also seems that the praise only a few receive for doing what is right is qualified in the cases of those who do not remove the high places. There are five kings who do what was right in Yhwh's eyes and are not compared to David. They did not remove the high places, and the people continued to worship there. Their acts lack cultic rigorism and their virtue is somewhat diminished by this qualifier. This is not unexpected. What is surprising is that Asa, who, like those five, does not remove the high places, is said to be like David. What makes Asa's judgment, as seen through both the grammatical construction and the triple praise, different from and more praiseworthy than the other five kings whose evaluations seem similar? If we can make any conclusion from the examples, those who are like David do some kind of reform, but not all reformers are like David. Further, to be like David does not require the removal of the high places. Evaluation of the third element of praise heaped on David, לבב שלם , may help clarify these designations.

C. "Heart" (לבב)

The third component of praise for the good kings is the directing of one's לבב , heart. The use of לבב in the Book of Kings as an evaluation of the kings is related to cultic loyalty, a prominent Deuteronomistic theme. The concept of "the love of God" in the Book of Deuteronomy reflects political loyalty as seen in suzerain treaties of the ancient Near East. Moshe Weinfeld describes it thus: "The suzerain demands the vassal's love of heart and soul or whole-hearted love."⁴⁰ In Deuteronomistic terms, loyalty is expressed through fidelity to the covenant.

The application of one's לבב , demonstrating loyalty, is connected with specific actions, as in Deut 10:12-13. The rhetorical question of "what does Yhwh require of you" defines this important behavior:

ועתה ישראל מה יהוה אלהיך שאל מעמך כי אם ליראה את יהוה אלהיך ללכת בכל דרכיו ולאבהב אתו ולעבד את יהוה אלהיך בכל לבבך ובכל נפשך לשמר את מצות יהוה ואת חקתיו אשר אנכי מצוך היום לטוב לך

And now, Israel, what does Yhwh your God ask of you? That you fear Yhwh your God, walk in all his ways and love him and serve Yhwh your God with all your heart and all your soul. Observe Yhwh's commandments and his laws, which I commanded you, for your well-being.

⁴⁰ Moshe Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1972; repr., Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1992) 81.

The connection between loving Yhwh בכל לבב and observing the commandments is made clear.

Though the concept of covenantal love and observance of the law is present in the Book of Samuel (e.g., 1 Sam 12:20, 24), it is never applied to David in that narrative. Instead, it relates to David only in Kings, and for the first time in the instructions to Solomon. In Kings, the concept of covenantal love and לבב is intrinsically connected with the Dtr's evaluation of the religious behavior of the good kings.

As our topic at hand is the evaluation of the kings, we may focus our understanding of the definition of directing one's לבב as one of the elements of praise in the regnal formulae. Only the three kings who are likened to David—Asa, Hezekiah, and Josiah—have a positive remark made about their לבב. The comment on Asa appears in the introductory regnal formula. Even though he did not remove the high places, Asa was wholeheartedly (לבב אסא היה שלם) with Yhwh (1 Kgs 15:14). The comment on Josiah appears in the closing formula and the statement of his incomparability: "There was no king before him who turned with all his heart and all his soul and all his might [בכל לבבו ובכל נפשו ובכל מאדו] to all the teaching of Moses, and none like him arose after him" (2 Kgs 23:25). The comment on Hezekiah is in his own prayer (2 Kgs 20:3). More commonly, לבב appears as a negative statement of a king not directing his heart (e.g., Jeroboam in 1 Kgs 14:8; Abijam in 1 Kgs 15:3; Jehu in 2 Kgs 10:31).

The application of the לבב is intrinsically connected with David, usually in the cases of kings who are not like him or who do not direct their hearts like him.

II. Was David like David?

Thus far the discussion has been focused on the following questions: What does it mean to be a good king? What does it mean to have a full heart and be wholeheartedly with Yhwh? And what does it mean to be like David? This final question requires further thought—was David like David? The answer, it seems, is that David as a royal comparative is a typological construct that functions to evaluate the kings but does not reflect the presentation of David in Samuel, even within its Deuteronomistically composed passages. Provan even divides the portrait of David into two different themes, the "comparative" and the "promissory."⁴¹ And while he suggests that both of these Davids are present in Kings, I propose that the David of Kings, in a typological sense, is the "comparative," while the David of Samuel is the "promissory," the one to whom the promise of eternal dynasty is made. In addition, rather than concentrating on specific individual verses, as Provan does to identify the two themes, the portrayal of the two Davids

⁴¹ Provan, *Hezekiah and the Books of Kings*, 91-131.

is pervasive throughout Kings and a primary literary tool for the construction of the narrative. Similarly, A. Graeme Auld recognizes “David as comparator.”⁴² It is clear, as von Rad says, that the picture of David “had a completely independent cycle of conceptions superimposed upon it, namely, that of the ideal, theocratic David, exemplary in obedience.”⁴³ In Kings, the Dtr projects his theology onto the preexisting portrait of David in Samuel. The implications of this distinction between the David of Samuel and the David of Kings are twofold. First, the distinction is another support for the theories of composition of Samuel (mentioned below) that the primary narrative and coherence of Samuel are pre-Deuteronomistic. In this way, the composition and redaction of Kings are differentiated from those of Samuel. Second, the Dtr creates a Davidic prototype that he uses to construct the portraits of subsequent kings. When creating this Deuteronomistic view of David, the Dtr has the other kings, especially Josiah, in mind. In this way, the Dtr simultaneously constructs a literary model on which to base the portraits of the other kings while also portraying those kings. In this way, the Dtr takes the well-known figure of the great king David and constructs the David of Kings to function as a literary tool to promote further his Deuteronomistic theology as a paradigm of obedience.

The disparity between the two Davidic portraits is seen in several ways. In particular, the characteristic evaluations of the kings are missing from the David story. The phrase *עשה הישר בעיני יהוה* does not appear in Samuel.⁴⁴ This is a result of the sparse Deuteronomistic elements in the book. Even in 2 Sam 5:4-5, where a somewhat typical regnal formula interrupts the David narrative, this common evaluation is missing:

בן שלשים שנה דוד במלכו ארבעים שנה מלך בחברון מלך על יהודה שבע שנים וששה חדשים ובירושלים מלך שלשים ושלוש שנה על כל ישראל ויהודה

David was thirty years old when he became king; he ruled forty years. In Hebron he was king over Judah seven years and six months, and in Jerusalem he reigned thirty years over all Israel and Judah.

Also significant, even in his discussion about the covenant at the plains of Moab, Weinfeld states, “David’s loyalty to God is couched in phrases that are even closer to the grant terminology” (i.e., meaning love and loyalty expressed through a *לבב* phrase), but he follows this comment with four textual examples, all of which are from Kings.⁴⁵ David’s covenant love and loyalty are not expressed in Samuel. This is a Deuteronomistic addition in Kings.

⁴² A. Graeme Auld, *Kings without Privilege: David and Moses in the Story of the Bible’s Kings* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994) 93.

⁴³ Von Rad, “Deuteronomistic Theology,” 88.

⁴⁴ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomist School*, 335.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 77.

There is some scholarly consensus that the narratives of Samuel are the product of earlier sources that the Dtr lightly redacted together, adding few editorial comments. Since the work of Leonhard Rost (1926), the Book of Samuel has been seen as the amalgamation of several complete and independent narratives.⁴⁶ As a whole, Samuel ignores many of the major concerns of the Dtr, such as the fight against idolatry and centralization of the cult.⁴⁷ The Dtr's compositional contribution to Samuel is minimal, while in Kings it is particularly strong.

In Samuel, therefore, Deuteronomistic concerns are limited. While much of the book is focused on transgression and punishment, especially in the David narratives, it is not the straight sin-and-punishment theology of Deuteronomy. David is not evaluated for transgressions against the covenant; instead, he is criticized for his actions in the Bathsheba affair and so on. David is praised for his zeal for Yhwh but not for his cultic activity. Despite the critique of David and the disputed effect it has on the overall content of the book, the central Deuteronomistic ideology expressed in Samuel is the unconditional validity of the eternal Davidic promise. This promise is expressed in Nathan's oracle in 2 Samuel 7, which many scholars have identified as Deuteronomistic and a later addition to the independent narratives.⁴⁸ 2 Samuel 7 emphasizes two major themes of the DtrH: the Davidic promise and the temple. Though the passage may be Deuteronomistic and directed to the proper worship of Yhwh, a place in Samuel where we might expect to see the same view of the good king as in Kings, it is very different. Even here, the establishment of the temple in Jerusalem with Solomon as its builder lacks the emphasis on removing idolatry and on fidelity to the covenant that is ever-present in Kings and linked to the evaluations of the good kings. Further, while the addition of this chapter to the pre-Deuteronomistic narratives of Samuel does direct the overall reading of the book, it does not transform its royal portrait into the theological perspective of Kings.

According to Weinfeld, in 2 Samuel 7, the Dtr "attaches the promise of the perpetuation of the dynasty to the Davidic dynasty in particular . . . provided that the Davidic house observe the law."⁴⁹ Contra Weinfeld, though the Davidic connection to the eternity of the dynasty is made in 2 Samuel 7, the covenant in Nathan's oracle is mostly unconditional, emphasizing the relationship between father and son. Obedience to the law, as articulated in Kings, is not expressed here.

⁴⁶ Leonhard Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronnachfolge Davids* (BWANT 42; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926); Eng. trans., *The Succession to the Throne of David* (trans. Michael D. Rutter and David M. Gunn; Historic Texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship 1; Sheffield: Almond, 1982).

⁴⁷ Moshe Garsiel, "The Book of Samuel: Its Composition, Structure and Significance as a Historiographical Source," *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 10 (2010) 21.

⁴⁸ P. Kyle McCarter, *II Samuel: A New Translation with Introduction, Notes, and Commentary* (AB 9; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984) 210.

⁴⁹ Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 5.

This is completely different from the perspective of Kings, where the fate of the people and the king depends on the king's covenant fidelity. It is only in Kings that the conditions compelling the Davidic house to observe the law are made. While 2 Samuel 7 establishes the Davidic house, the characteristic language of obedience is missing. In a work where the language of covenant, *bērît*, is so prevalent (the Dtr uses *bērît* more than any other author), the promise in 2 Samuel 7 is not constructed as a *bērît*, which would entail reciprocal commitments by both parties: on the part of the king (and Israel), fidelity to the law. The Dtr does not use *bērît* except to talk about the covenant of the patriarchs and the Mosaic covenant, not in relation to the promise to David.⁵⁰

It is significant that in 2 Samuel 7—with its central role in Deuteronomistic theology (establishing the eternity of the Davidic dynasty) and in view of the consensus that this is indeed a Deuteronomistic passage (as early as Julius Wellhausen, scholars have associated the composition of 2 Samuel 7 with Josiah's court)—the typical Deuteronomistic phraseology is absent. There is no mention of the מצוות ("commandments"), of the חקים ומשפטים ("statutes and ordinances"), as usually found in connection with Deuteronomistic reward. Even though scholars like P. Kyle McCarter assert that the passage reflects the "themes from the larger history," this chapter stands in stark contrast to the portraits of the kings in Kings and especially to the depiction of David as the paradigm of Deuteronomistic covenant behavior.⁵¹

III. The Davidic Prototype

The best picture we have of David's commitment to the covenant is retrospectively found in the Solomon story. The portrait of David as the prototype of the good king is first developed as bookends in the Solomon story. First, David is the exemplar for Solomon and then, at the end of his reign, the standard to which Solomon does not measure up. Solomon, given specific instructions of how to be a good king, helps to define what that role means. Solomon functions proleptically for all the kings, good and bad. Through the portrait of Solomon, the prototype of the comparative David is constructed, against which Solomon, the first good and bad king, and all subsequent kings can be measured. The concept of the good king, one who is faithful to the covenant, is first established in 1 Kgs 2:3-4, in David's charge to Solomon. Prosperity and dynastic continuity depend on the king's following the laws and commandments, statutes and testimonies of the law of Moses.

First, in 1 Kgs 2:3-4, before instructing Solomon to do away with all of his enemies, David orders Solomon to keep the covenant in order to ensure that the promise Yhwh made to David of an eternal dynasty will be fulfilled. This is also

⁵⁰ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 260.

⁵¹ McCarter, *II Samuel*, 215.

where we see the beginning of the construction of David as obedient to the Deuteronomistic covenant:

ושמרת את משמרת יהוה אלהיך ללכת בדרכיו לשמר חקתיו מצותיו ומשפטיו ועדותיו ככתוב בתורת משה למען תשכיל את כל אשר תעשה ואת כל אשר תפנה שם למען יקים יהוה את דברו אשר דבר עלי לאמר אם ישמרו בניך את דרכם ללכת לפני באמת בכל לבבם ובכל נפשם לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל

Keep the mandates of Yhwh your God, following his ways, keeping his statutes and commandments, laws and warnings, as is written in the instruction of Moses, so that you will be successful in whatever you do and to whatever you turn. In order that Yhwh will fulfill his word which he spoke to me, saying, if your sons are careful in their way to walk before me faithfully with all their heart and with all their soul, no one will be cut off from the throne of Israel.

These verses express many of the most crucial concepts of Deuteronomistic covenant theology.⁵² Verse 3 describes the condition for success as linked to careful observance of Yhwh's laws, stipulated in the multiple terms of the חקים, מצות, משפטים, עדות, as repeated often throughout Kings. Verse 4 highlights the conditions for an eternal Davidic kingship as dependent on the faithfulness of David's sons, in the directing of ובכל לבב ובכל נפש, which requires the application of the heart and soul as the way to observe the commandments and demonstrate loyalty, as in the suzerain treaties. Although he does not explicitly say, "Just as I did," we presume that the David portrayed in this passage behaved in this way. The tone and content of these verses are very different from what follows in the rest of the chapter. It is clear that these initial theological instructions are added to the pre-existing narrative by the Dtr to begin the process of establishing the Davidic prototype. The portrait of David that begins to be depicted here is entirely different from that of the Book of Samuel.

In his initial actions, Solomon follows the statutes of his father, David (ויאהב) ויאביו שלמה את יהוה ללכת בחקות דוד אביו [1 Kgs 3:3]; this is in contrast to his later act of loving [אהב] foreign women, which leads to his downfall [1 Kgs 11:1]). In addition, at Gibeon, Solomon appeals to the image of David as Yhwh's servant: ויאמר שלמה אתה עשית עם עבדך דוד אבי חסד גדול כאשר הלך לפניך באמת ובצדקה ובישרת עמך "And Solomon said [to Yhwh], 'You showed great favor for your servant David, my father, because he walked before you in faithfulness and righteousness and the integrity (rightness) of his heart was with you'" (1 Kgs 3:6). In Yhwh's response to Solomon's prayer at Gibeon, the connections between the David of the Book of Samuel (the lover of Yhwh and recipient of Yhwh's favor) and the prototypical David constructed in Kings (the Deuteronomistically adherent) are made. In granting Solomon's request for wisdom, Yhwh affirms that observance of the laws and commandments ensures long life and being like David: ואם תלך בדרכו

⁵² Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School*, 334.

לשמר חקי כאשר הלך דוד אביך והארכתי את ימך, “And if you walk in my way, observing my laws and commandments, as David your father walked, I will lengthen your days” (1 Kgs 3:14).

Similar to the events at Gibeon, the development of the David concept continues with another prayer–response sequence. The image of David is doubly affirmed through Solomon’s prayer and Yhwh’s response after the building and dedication of the temple. In 1 Kgs 6:12, Yhwh says: *הבית הזה אשר אתה בנה אם תלך בחקתו ואת משפטי תעשה ושמרת את כל מצותי ללכת בהם והקמתי את דברי אתך אשר דברתי אל דוד אביך*, “This House which you have built, if you follow my laws and statutes, you shall do and observe all my commandments following them and I will establish this word with you as I spoke to David your father.” It is unclear exactly what Yhwh is promising David. What is the “word”? Presumably it is the eternity of the Davidic dynasty, as seen in 2 Samuel 7, but the language of covenant loyalty as connected to observing the law is missing from the promise in 2 Samuel 7 (as discussed above). In fact, the conditional covenant established here with Solomon is wholly different from the one established with David. This sets the tone for the relationship between Yhwh and subsequent kings.

Solomon offers his prayer to Yhwh in 1 Kings 8, suggesting what it means to be wholeheartedly with Yhwh (1 Kgs 8:61): Solomon directs Israel to set its heart to be fully with Yhwh, *והיה לבבכם שלם עם יהוה אלהינו*. In response, Yhwh reaffirms and elaborates on the promise of 6:12, further articulating how David behaved and what Solomon will receive if he emulates David:

ואתה אם תלך לפני כאשר הלך דוד אביך בתם לבב ובישר לעשות ככל אשר צויתוך חקי ומשפטי תשמר והקמתי את כסא ממלכתך על ישראל לעלם כאשר דברתי על דוד אביך לאמר לא יכרת לך איש מעל כסא ישראל

And if you walk before me as David your father walked with a blameless heart and righteousness, doing all that I commanded you, my laws and statutes you will observe. And I will establish the throne of your kingship over Israel forever as I spoke to David your father, saying there will not be a man of yours cut off from the throne of Israel. (1 Kgs 9:4-5)

These verses establish the conditional nature of the Davidic promise as expressed in Kings.

The rise of Solomon and the development of the Davidic prototype heighten the impact of the fall of Solomon. These early chapters of Kings create a constructed character that is used to evaluate all the kings, but few have the ability to live up to the standard. At the end of the narrative in 1 Kings 11, Solomon is portrayed as a bad king; he was not like David. In his old age Solomon has a change of heart: *ולא היה לבבו שלם עם יהוה אלהיו כלבב דוד אביו*, “And his heart was not fully with Yhwh his God, as was the heart of David his father” (v. 4). Further, in 1 Kgs 11:6, in a judgment similar to the regnal formulae, Solomon’s deeds are evaluated negatively: *ויעש שלמה הרע בעיני יהוה ולא מלא אחרי יהוה כדוד אביו*, “And

Solomon did what was evil in the eyes of Yhwh and he was not fully behind Yhwh like David his father.”

The creation of the prototype construction begins with the establishment of the kings who succeed David. Solomon is set up with conditions of how to be like David. He is to keep the laws and the statutes, walking in the way of Yhwh as David did (1 Kgs 3:14; 6:12; 9:4-5). Both the potential buildup of how Solomon should be and the rebuke for the reality of the character of Solomon highlight what it means to be like David.

The transition from the David of Samuel to the Davidic prototype of Kings begins with the Dtr's transforming the unconditional promise of 2 Samuel 7 into the Davidic comparative typology, with its conditional success, as depicted in Kings. The Dtr reimagines the promise of a Davidic dynasty, taking on the themes of 2 Samuel 7, in which David is established as an essential character in the history of the monarchy, and exploiting the importance of David in founding the dynasty. This role sets David up as worthy of the role of the prototype of the good king. It is then in Solomon's succession of David that the Dtr makes his covenantal requirements for the continuity of the dynasty apparent.

In this way, the Dtr creates a prototype of the good king, and the best of the good kings—one who is faithful to Yhwh and the covenant and initiates religious reform. The Dtr retrospectively projects this image onto the known figure of King David, the eponymous ancestor of the Davidic dynasty. This convention is only used in Kings; even though Samuel chronicles the reign of David, the portrait of the cultically adherent king is missing. Given the establishment of the Davidic prototype of the measure of the good king, it is not surprising that only kings of the Davidic dynasty, as opposed to the kings of Israel, might achieve praiseworthy status. Though this literary application occurs, it is clear that the model of the good king is not based on the portrait of David in Samuel. It is much more likely that the prototypical David constructed in Kings is modeled on the figure of Josiah, the great reformer, the hero of the Book of Kings, and out of whose court the history emerges.⁵³ We see in 2 Kings 22–23 how completely Josiah fulfills and even supersedes the Davidic prototype. More generally, it is possible to see that, although both show the mark of the Dtr, Samuel and Kings had unique compositional and redactional paths. The pre-Deuteronomistic source documents that make up the majority of the narrative of Samuel have different foci and narrate the story of a different David, while the portrait of David found in Kings is thoroughly Deuteronomistic.

My analysis of the prototype strategy takes von Rad's argument for the use of a Davidic prototype and further develops it. This strategy can be explored in considering its literary value to the entirety of Kings. The Davidic prototype is used to construct the portrait of the kings. From the original portrait of David in

⁵³ Nelson, *Double Redaction*, 125.

Kings, the prototype is used to evaluate all subsequent kings, those who are like or unlike David. The kings in whom the Dtr is particularly interested and who receive longer and fuller attention are fleshed out through the use of the prototype in order to establish their significant role in the history of Israel and Judah and to act as didactic figures to convey the importance of fidelity to the tenets of the Deuteronomistic covenant theology. It is possible to see the use of the prototype most clearly in the portraits of Solomon, Jeroboam, and Josiah. Jeroboam is first established (1 Kings 11) as the realization of the Davidic prototype. He is initially set up as a potential second David. Ultimately, he does not maintain this role and is constructed as the anti-David, the antithesis to the Davidic prototype (see esp. 1 Kings 14). The bad kings, particularly those of the kingdom of Israel, are said to walk in the ways of Jeroboam. In contrast, Josiah is the only king to inhabit the literary model completely. Throughout the history of the monarchy, each king is held up against the Davidic prototype. These comparisons create a literary unity in the portraits of the kings as well as a characteristic marker of the level of redaction.

The use of the prototype strategy also further refines the themes outlined by Cross in his double redaction theory. Cross highlights two contrasting themes in the preexilic history: the faithfulness of David and the sin of Jeroboam.⁵⁴ The use of the prototype strategy makes the discussion of the contrast of these themes more precise. This is not just a matter of the acts of the kings and the effects they have on the course of the history of the monarchy as Cross presents them, but the contrast between David and Jeroboam, as the anti-David, is intrinsic to the literary construction of the portrait of these and the other kings. These kings are inherently connected to each other through their literary relationship to the prototype strategy and not just in the contrasting of themes. This is further developed in the portrait of Josiah, who not only is fashioned in the Davidic prototype, perhaps even surpassing his model, but also is depicted as the antidote to the anti-David. Only Josiah, in his role as the next David, has the ability to overturn the sins of Jeroboam. No other king, not even Hezekiah, has this potential, because of the absence of the Davidic model. In this way, the Davidic prototype becomes the primary literary convention in crafting the portrait of the kings, highlighting the major themes and promoting Deuteronomistic theology, which is characteristic of the Josianic edition.

Recognition of the prototype strategy also functions as a criterion in the scholarly conversation of identifying and dating the redactional levels of Kings, allowing us new means for evaluating redaction. At the center of the prototype strategy is the figure of Josiah. He is the model for the Davidic prototype, and his reign is the climax of the history. For those who argue for a Hezekian history, it is noteworthy that the prototype strategy is not applied to Hezekiah, even though he is a

⁵⁴ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 274-89.

“good” king, but the strategy is used for kings who precede him, namely, Solomon, Jeroboam, and, less fully, all the kings of Israel. For those who accept Cross’s double redaction hypothesis, the prototype strategy provides additional support for a Josianic redaction, advancing beyond the recognition of themes, as Cross discusses, which reflect only the interests of the historian, to acknowledging the intentional technique of crafting the portraits of the kings in relation to Josiah. Finally, for those who disagree with a first, primary, preexilic edition of the history, the prototype strategy provides an undeniable link to the person and reign of Josiah, shows an intentional literary plan that spans the beginning of the monarchy until the time of Josiah, and contrasts with the later account of Manasseh, where the prototype strategy is transformed to reflect exilic concerns and depicts an evil king crafted on the model of Ahab rather than Jeroboam as the anti-David.

Copyright of Catholic Biblical Quarterly is the property of Catholic Biblical Association of America and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.